



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,519	06/09/2006	Long Li	42P21666	1002
45209	7590	10/05/2009	EXAMINER	
INTEL/BSTZ			NAHAR, QAMRUN	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY				2191
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/05/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/582,519	LI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	QAMRUN NAHAR	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 June 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/16/2008</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-28 have been examined.

### *Specification*

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Field of the Invention and Summary sections are missing on pg 1 of the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Objections*

. Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities: a colon is missing at the end of line 2 of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 22 reciting a “computer-readable medium”, is not limited to tangible storage devices in view of pg. 3, par. 0013, in the instant specification, which suggests that such a medium may be a carrier wave or transmission medium (intangible). Accordingly, claim 22 does not recite tangible manufactures, and are non-statutory subject matter.

As per claims 23-28, these claims are rejected for failing to cure the deficiencies of the above rejected base claim 22.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chang, et al.

"Impact: An Architectural Framework for Multiple-Instruction-Issue Processors", 1991

(hereinafter "Chang").

**Per Claim 1:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- extracting an asynchronous signal from a memory access instruction in a program to represent a latency of the memory access instruction ("... inline expansion ..." on pg. 268, e.g. see section 2.3)

- and generating a wait instruction to wait for the asynchronous signal ("... Prepass code scheduling is performed prior to register allocation ..." on pg. 268, e.g. see section 2.4).

**Per Claim 2:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- further comprising: enforcing a first dependence between the memory access Instruction and the wait instruction via the asynchronous signal (e.g. on pg. 268, see section 2.5).

**Per Claim 3:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- further comprising: introducing a pseudo signal to enforce a second dependence between the wait instruction and a memory access dependent Instruction (e.g. on pg. 268, see section 2.3).

**Per Claim 4:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- further comprising: making the memory access instruction define the asynchronous signal; and making the wait instruction use the asynchronous signal (on pg. 268, e.g. see section 2.4).

**Per Claim 5:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- further comprising: making the wait instruction define a pseudo signal; and making an instruction that depends on the completion of the memory access instruction use the pseudo signal (e.g. on pg. 268, see section 2.3).

**Per Claim 6:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- further comprising: storing the asynchronous signal in a signal register of a network device (pg. 267, see the par. right before section 2.1).

**Per Claim 7:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- storing the pseudo signal in a pseudo signal register of a network device (pg. 267, see the par. right before section 2.1 and on pg. 268, see section 2.3).

**Per Claim 8:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- performing a first code motion on a first set of one or more instructions except each memory access instruction in the program (“... inline expansion ...” on pg. 268, e.g. see section 2.3)
- and performing a second code motion on a second set of one or more instructions except each wait instruction in the program, to increase a number of instructions between issue and completion of the memory access instruction (“... Prepass code scheduling is performed prior to register allocation ...” on pg. 268, e.g. see section 2.4).

**Per Claim 9:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- wherein the first code motion comprises moving the first instruction set forward through one or more paths of the program with the memory access instructions fixed, and the second code motion comprises moving the second instruction set backward through the one or more paths of the program with the wait Instructions fixed (e.g. on pg. 268, see section 2.3).

**Per Claim 10:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- wherein the first code motion comprises sinking the one or more instructions in the first set that occur in each predecessor block of a successor block into the successor block, and the second code motion comprises hoisting the one or more Instructions in the second set (e.g. on pg. 268, see section 2.3).

**Per Claim 11:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- performing a speculative code motion on a wait instruction, in response to determining that the wait instruction is absent in at least one predecessor blocks of a successor block (on pg. 268, see section 2.5).

**Per Claim 12:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- in response to determining that the number of occurrence of a wait instruction in predecessor blocks of a successor block is less than the number of the predecessor blocks, appending a compensation code for the wait instruction to one or more predecessors that lack the wait instruction; removing the wait instruction from the predecessors; and prepending an instruction instance of the wait instruction to the successor block (on pg. 268, see section 2.4 and 2.5).

**Per Claim 13:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- a code motion unit to perform code motion in a program subject to a dependence constraint of the program to hide a latency of a memory access instruction in the program (on pg. 268, e.g. see section 2.4).

**Per Claim 14:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- further comprising: an intermediate language unit to represent a memory access instruction in a program with an asynchronous signal associated with a latency of the memory access instruction (on pg. 268, e.g. see section 2.4).

**Per Claim 15:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- further comprising: an intermediate language unit to represent a memory access instruction in a program with an asynchronous signal associated with a latency of the memory access instruction (on pg. 268, e.g. see section 2.4).

**Per Claim 16:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- further comprising: an intermediate language unit to define a pseudo signal in a wait instruction associated with the memory access instruction and to make an instruction that depends on the memory access instruction use the pseudo signal (on pg. 268, e.g. see sections 2.3 and 2.4).

**Per Claim 17:**

The Chang publication discloses:

Art Unit: 2191

- wherein the code motion unit further to move a wait instruction associated with the memory access instruction and a first set of one or more instructions in a first direction subject to the dependent constraint, with the memory access instruction fixed; and move the memory access instruction and a second set of one or more instructions in the program subject to the dependent constraint in a second direction that is opposite to the first direction, with the wait instruction fixed (on pg. 268, e.g. see sections 2.4 and 2.5).

**Per Claim 18:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- wherein the code motion unit further to sink a wait instruction associated with the memory access instruction and a first set of one or more instructions of the program from each predecessor block to a successor block at a merging point of the predecessor blocks subject to the dependence constraint of the program, in response to determining that each predecessor block comprises the wait Instruction and the one or more instructions, with the memory access instruction fixed; and hoist the memory access instruction and a second set of one or more instructions in the program subject to the dependent constraint, with the wait instruction fixed (on pg. 268, e.g. see sections 2.3 and 2.4).

**Per Claim 19:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- wherein the code motion unit further to perform a speculative code motion on a wait instruction associated with the memory access instruction, in response to determining that the wait instruction is present in a first predecessor block of a merging successor block of the program and is absent in a second predecessor block of the merging successor block (on pg. 268, see section 2.4 and 2.5).

**Per Claim 20:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- wherein the code motion unit further to recognize a wait instruction associated with the memory access instruction as a motion candidate subject to a dependence constraint of the program; in response to determining that the wait instruction is present in a first predecessor block of the merging successor block and is absent in a second predecessor block of the merging successor block, insert a compensation code for the wait instruction into the second predecessor block; and sink the wait instruction into a merging successor block of the first and second predecessor blocks subject to the dependence constraint (on pg. 268, see section 2.4 and 2.5).

**Per Claim 21:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- wherein the code motion unit further to hoist the memory access instruction subject to the dependence constraint (pg. 268, e.g. see section 2.4).

**Per Claims 22-23:**

These machine readable medium versions of the claimed method discussed above (claims 8 and 12, respectively), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also anticipated by Chang.

**Per Claim 24:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- wherein the machine readable medium further comprising instructions that in response to being executed result in the computing device appending a wait instruction corresponding to the candidate to each of said one or more predecessor blocks where the candidate is absent (pg. 268, e.g. see section 2.4).

**Per Claim 25:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- wherein the machine readable medium further comprising instructions that in response to being executed result in the computing device sinking each wait Instruction corresponding to the candidate in each predecessor blocks of the first block into the first block (on pg. 268, see section 2.4 and 2.5).

**Per Claim 26:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- wherein the machine readable medium further comprising instructions that in response to being executed result in the computing device in response to determining that a number of occurrence of the candidate in the predecessor blocks equals to a number of the predecessor blocks, removing each instruction corresponding to the candidate from each predecessor block of the first block; and prepending an instruction instance of the candidate to the first block (on pg. 268, see section 2.4 and 2.5).

**Per Claim 27:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- wherein the machine readable medium further comprising instructions that in response to being executed result in the computing device updating a dependent constraint of predecessor blocks of the first block (pg. 268, e.g. see section 2.4).

**Per Claim 28:**

The Chang publication discloses:

- wherein the machine readable medium further comprising instructions that in response to being executed result in the computing device determining a sinking candidate from one or more

instructions of the program except the memory access instruction, based on a dependence constraint of the program; performing a code sinking on each Instruction corresponding to the sinking candidate subject to the dependence constraint; determining a hoisting candidate from one or more instructions of the program except a wait Instruction associated with the memory access instruction, based on the dependence constraint of the program; and performing a code hoisting on each instruction corresponding to the hoisting candidate subject to the dependence constraint (pg. 268, e.g. see sections 2.4 and 2.5).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Qamrun Nahar whose telephone number is (571) 272-3730. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays from 10:00 AM to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y Zhen, can be reached on (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or processing is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2191

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Qamrun Nahar/

Qamrun Nahar

Art Unit 2191